

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed August 26, 2004, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 15, 2001.

Claims 1-10 and 12-29 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 5, 10, 16, 20 and 24 are independent. Claims 7-9, 13 and 16-29 have been withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 10, 12, 14 and 15 are currently elected, of which claims 1, 5 and 10 are independent, and of which claims 1 and 5 are generic. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action objects to informalities in the priority claim to Application Serial No. 09/150,933 (page 2, Paper No. 10). In response, the Applicants have prepared a *Corrected Application Data Sheet* attached herewith which properly includes the claim to the '933 application.

Paragraph 4 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-6 as anticipated by Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure. The Applicants respectfully submit that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against independent claim 1 and dependent claim 6 of the present application, as amended. With respect to independent claim 5, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because the Official Action has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure do not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently. Independent claim 1 and dependent claim 6 have been amended to that each of a plurality of clock lines or each base portion of a plurality of clock lines is made of a two-layer structure, a lower layer of the two-layer structure comprising the same wiring material as gate electrodes of the thin film transistors and, an upper layer of the two-layer structure comprising the same wiring material as source and drain electrodes of thin film transistors, where the lower layer extends in a same direction of the upper layer. These features are supported in the specification by Figure 1, for example. Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure do not teach that a lower layer extends in a same direction as an upper layer, either explicitly or inherently.

With respect to independent claim 5, Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure do not teach wiring lines crossing clock lines or base portions of the clock lines, where the wiring lines comprise a same layer as black matrices, either explicitly or inherently.

Since Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure do not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

Paragraph 7 of the Official Action rejects claims 10, 12, 14 and 15 as obvious based on the combination of Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure and U.S. Patent No. 5,815,223 to Watanabe et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference


teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Independent claim 10 has been amended to recite a semiconductor device where a shielding line disposed on an interval between clock lines is made of a two-layer structure, a lower layer of the two-layer structure comprising the same wiring material as gate electrodes of thin film transistors and, an upper layer of the two-layer structure comprising the same wiring material as source and drain electrodes of the thin film transistors, where the lower layer extends in the same direction as the upper layer. These features are supported in the specification by Figure 15, for example. Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure and Watanabe do not teach or suggest at least the above-referenced features of the present invention.

Since Figures 5 and 6 of the Applicants' disclosure and Watanabe do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789